

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RAYMOND A. TREON,

Petitioner,

v.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS.,

Respondent.

Case No. 1:25-cv-00122-HBK (HC)¹

ORDER RELATING AND REASSIGNING
CASES

RAYMOND A. TREON,

Petitioner,

v.

BUREAU OF PRISONS,

Respondent.

Case No. 1:25-cv-00279-SAB (HC)

¹ Both parties have consented to the jurisdiction of a magistrate judge in accordance with 28 U.S.C. §636(c)(1) in this first filed action. (Doc. No. 13).

1 RAYMOND A. TREON,
2 Petitioner,
3 v.
4 FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS,
5 Respondent.

Case No. 1:25-cv-00280-SKO (HC)

8 On May 6, 2025, Respondent filed a motion to dismiss without prejudice in each of the
9 respective cases. *See* Case No. 1:25-cv-00122-HBK (Doc. No. 10); Case No. 1:25-cv-00279-
10 SAB (Doc. No. 9); Case No. 1:25-cv-00280-SKO (Doc. No. 8). Respondent primarily requests
11 “relation of all matters before the same jurist in a single denoted matter” pursuant to Local Rule
12 123 and asks that the current briefing deadlines in each matter be vacated. *See, e.g.*, Case No.
13 1:25-cv-00122-HBK (Doc. No. 10 at 2-3). Alternatively, Respondent indicates the Court “may
14 dismiss two matters, without prejudice, to Petitioner filing an amended petition in the (third)
15 remaining matter raising all grounds.” *Id.*

16 Examination of the actions reveals that the cases are related within the meaning of Local
17 Rule 123(a). The actions involve the same property, transaction, or event, and similar questions
18 of fact and the same question of law. Assignment of these cases to the same judge is likely to
19 effect a substantial savings of judicial effort, whereas substantial duplication of labor would result
20 if the actions were heard by different judges.

21 The parties should be aware that relating the cases under Local Rule 123(a) merely has the
22 result that the related cases are assigned to the same judge; no consolidation of the actions is
23 effected. Under the regular practice of this court, related cases are generally assigned to the judge
24 and magistrate judge to whom the first filed action was assigned.

25 Therefore, **IT IS ORDERED:**

26 (1) Respondent’s motion in each of the pending cases is GRANTED consistent with the
27 below.
28 (2) The action denominated as 1:25-cv-00279-SAB is reassigned to Magistrate Judge

1 Helena Barch-Kuchta for all further proceedings. Henceforth, the caption on
2 documents filed in the reassigned case shall be shown as 1:25-cv-00279-HBK.

3 (3) The action denominated as 1:25-cv-00280-SKO is also reassigned to Magistrate Judge
4 Helena Barch-Kuchta for all further proceedings. Henceforth, the caption on the

5 documents filed in the reassigned case shall be shown as 1:25-cv-00280-HBK.

6 (4) The undersigned as the Magistrate Judge to Case No. 1:24-cv-00919-HBK will
7 remain.

8 (5) The Clerk of Court shall make appropriate adjustment in the assignment of habeas
9 cases to compensate for this reassignment.

10 (6) The briefing schedule in each case is VACATED pending further order of the Court.

11
12 Dated: May 8, 2025



13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
HELENA M. BARCH-KUCHTA
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE